

test of the President, as being among the best models of our parliamentary history affairs.

In the present sketch of Mr. Calhoun's career, only the outlines of his political life and conduct have been given. Many important particulars have, from necessity, been entirely omitted, and space now remains to add only a short notice of his family, his person, and his private character, and to make a few concluding remarks.

On the 8th of May, 1811, Mr. Calhoun was married to Miss Floride Calhoun, the daughter of John Ewing Calhoun, formerly a Senator in Congress of great respectability, from South Carolina. They have seven children, five of them are sons, and two daughters.

In his person, Mr. Calhoun is slender and tall. His countenance at rest is strikingly marked by decision and firmness. In conversation, it is highly animated, expressive, and indicative of genius. His eyes are large, dark brilliant, and penetrating, and leave no doubt at first view of a high order of intellect. His manners are easy, natural, and unassuming, and as frank as they are cordial and kind. He has none of the cautious reserve and mystery of common politicians; but is accessible to all, agreeable, instructive, and eloquent in conversation, and communicates his opinions with the utmost freedom and unreserve.

In all his domestic relations his life is without a blemish.

As an orator, he stands in the foremost rank of parliamentary speakers. On first rising in debate, he has ever felt the anxiety of diffidence, which is almost always the companion of genius. His manner of speaking is energetic, ardent, rapid, and marked by a solemn earnestness, which inspires a full belief in his sincerity and deep conviction. His style is forcible, logical and condensed; often figurative for illustration, never for ornament. His mind is amply stored with the fruits of learning, but still more with those of observation and reflection. Hence depth, originality, and power, characterize all his efforts.

As a statesman, in the most large and elevated sense of the term, he has no superior; for to the highest intellectual powers, he unites those elevated moral qualities, which are equally essential with ability to complete the character of a perfect statesman—inflexible integrity—honor without a stain, disinterestedness, temperance, and industry; a firmness of purpose which disdains to calculate the consequences of doing his duty; prudence and energy in action, devotion to his country, and an inextinguishable love of liberty and justice.

#### PROF. MAFFITT'S SECOND LECTURE.

The second of the series of lectures by Mr. Maffitt was delivered at the Light-st. Church, on Friday evening last, the subject of which was *Genius*.

The orator commenced with a brief allusion to each of the constituent qualities of genius, and commenting thereon.

"Genius is displayed, not in grandeur and magnificence alone; it is seen in the cotton-gin, as well as the Principia of Newton; it is in the Iliad of Homer, as well as the lever of Archimedes; it was in the song of Miriam; in the plan of Washington, for the surprise of Cornwallis, at Trenton; it was in the daring of Napoleon at the bridge of Lodi; it constructs edifices, fills up valleys, bridges the Atlantic, and hangs the railway upon the verge of the mountain cliffs. It was the genius of benevolence, that sent Howard forth on his tour of philanthropy; taught Wesley to lay down principles whose excellence was to be felt through long vistas of coming generations; and urged Matthew, the apostle of temperance, to the vast labor he has undergone, in removing a plague-spot from the escutcheon of that land whose genius has filled the world with admiration, as her sons have emblazoned her name upon the scroll of honor, with a pen of fire!

"Genius was in Caesar's *Veni vidi vici*; it was in the words of Nelson at *Tratagar*—'England expects every man this day to do his duty'; in the language of Franklin, 'Where liberty dwells, there is my country'; in the last speech of Robert Emmet, 'Until Ireland is free, let not my epitaph be written.' It was in that appropriate thought which adorned the grave of the dead with the weeping willow, that dropping emblem of perpetual sorrow. Earth, ocean, thoughts of eternity, and a coming resurrection, were all full of genius." (Balt. Sun.)

#### GENERAL DUFF GREEN.

The London correspondent of the N. Y. Journal of Commerce says:

"General Duff Green, who has been now sometime in London, has nearly brought to a successful issue negotiations for establishing a system of barter between some first rate commercial houses here and an establishment to be formed at Cairo, in the West. Vessels are to go direct from this port to the latter, being freighted with British manufactured goods, and to return here with American produce. There are to be no money transactions whatever. The General is the author of several able letters in the Times newspaper, signed 'An American,' which are now being collected and published in a pamphlet."

Dr. Channing, the distinguished divine and author, died at Bennington, Vermont, on the evening of the 21st ult. His body was to be removed to Boston for interment.

There were seventeen deaths from Yellow Fever at the Charity Hospital in New Orleans, during the week ending on Saturday last.

## THE DEMOCRAT.

CANTON, MISS.

SATURDAY.....OCTOBER 22, 1842.

FOR PRESIDENT,

JOHN C. CALHOUN,  
OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

[Subject to the decision of a National Convention.]

"Nor is our Government to be maintained, or our Union preserved by invasions of the rights and powers of the several States. In thus attempting to make our General Government strong, we make it weak.—Its true strength consists in leaving individuals and States, as much as possible, to themselves—in making itself felt, not in its power, but in its beneficence, not in its control, but in its protection, not in binding the States more closely to the centre, but leaving each to move unobstructed in its proper orbit."—Jackson.

#### MR. CALHOUN'S LIFE.

We publish to-day, a sketch of Mr. Calhoun's life, believing that many of our readers will be glad to read it. It reaches only up to 1835. Since that time his life has been as eventful as ever before, in the same length of time. He took the lead in 1837, in the support of Mr. Van Buren's administration—especially on the great question of the currency—the separation of the power and influence of the banks from the over-grown power of the Government. Towards the re-election of that distinguished patriot and statesman, Mr. Calhoun contributed all the force of his moral and intellectual character. The people, however, by a sort of unknown political *ignis fatuus*, against the light of reason and truth, were led insensibly to the brink of the dark gulch of Federalism;—from being sunk beneath its waves, Mr. Calhoun has, doubtless done more to rescue us, than any other man. By the force of his exalted talents, and his stern, moral and political virtue, aided by reason and truth, he has vastly contributed towards leading us back into "the way in which we should go," and towards the re-establishment of republican principles, which is fast taking place, and of which, we have such pleasing earnest in the elections which have taken place throughout the Union. The Democrats acknowledge him as their leader, and most proud are they of him.

*Those who live in glass houses, should not throw stones.*

A writer in the Mississippi Creole, who adopts the misnomer of Candour, saw fit to attack our first editorial, and since then, he has continued to send his weekly mis-tils at us. Now, we could not object to this if we would, and, most surely, we would not if we could. Our political principles are like precious metals, the more you rub them, the more beautiful and brilliant they will appear; we would, therefore, rather invite than avoid attacks upon them. Besides, when we reared our standard here, on the strong grounds of the enemy, we did not expect that Federalism would stand, quietly and unobtrusively by, and permit us to encamp upon ground of which they had been so long in the undisputed possession, and on which they had so long been accustomed to play "such fantastic tricks," "with none to molest or make them afraid." But we confess we did not expect such sudden attacks; though we care not how thick and fast they come, so long as we can see our enemy—the fight is then fair. "We wish always to know our adversary, and for him to be known;" and accordingly on the day his first attack appeared, we informed Candour, through our columns, that, if he would publish his name, together with the book and page—wherein to find the authority he quoted against us, he might expect a response to his piece. On these conditions we were then, and are now, anxious to

"Meet Bombastes face to face!" He refused to comply with either condition. In declining to give his name, he assimilated himself to Junius—(the justness of which assimilation, we shall not question)—and concluded that it was far more proper that his name, like the birth of Napoleon, should be "shrouded in the solitude of its own originality." Now we confess we had no right to demand his real name, yet, certainly, we had a right to expect a frank avowal of it, from one who claimed to be the very personification of Candour. But we had a right to demand of Candour, the "book and page," that we might have all the testimony against us—that we might know the witness and the circumstances under which he testified, so that we might impeach his credibility or competency, or rebut his testimony, by that of other witnesses more authentic. But the witness was politically infamous, and did not believe in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, the political bible upon which he must needs have been sworn before he would be competent to testify as to our supposed political sins. It would not do, therefore, to confront the witness with us—we were asked to take him upon trust, as the Whigs do their presidents; the "book and page" were not given, the witnesses name, like Candour's, is kept dark, lest by its exposure, the world

should see that the opinions of Daniel Webster, are ultra-federalist, with whom we glory that we scarcely ever did entertain one sentiment in common, are entitled to no more weight, when read as evidence against Democratic faith, than are the doctrines of Tom Paine, when adduced against the faith of the Christian.

We probably might have waived our call for Candour's real name, and have entered the lists against his shadow, if he had not exhibited such a want of all candor, fairness and justice, in thus withholding the "book and page," without any excuse or apology. A warfare with him would, therefore, now be dishonorable. His third communication however, comes to us with the express endorsement by the late *pro tem* Editor of the *Creole*. We have, therefore, a right to hold him responsible for the political errors of his principal; we shall now proceed to do so, though we confess we entirely depart therefrom from our determination at first expressed, to "embark into no crusade against wind-mills." Our article was written to show that Mr. Clay had no claims to the support of the South—and that no party in the South can support him for the office of President, "without an abandonment of all former professions and principles, and a marked disregard of every thing like consistency." To prove this, we referred to the ground which the Whigs of the South professed to occupy in 1840, on the two subjects of the tariff, and the power of Congress over slavery in the District of Columbia, and with them we compared Mr. Clay's principles and opinions now entertained, and showed we think, their utter difference and irreconcilableness. The *pro tem*, of the *Creole*, however, thinks differently and with oracular wisdom, pragmatically announces to the public, that Candour had "blown his (own) charges against Mr. Clay to the winds." Now we have before shown that the *pro tem*, altho' he took upon himself to speak so confidently and dogmatically, did not understand what, at least, one of our "charges" was. We propose, now, to re-state what was the first "charge" made in our article, and to examine how far the assertion of the *pro tem*, is true, and how far untrue; reserving to ourselves the liberty of rejoicing to what he says as to our second charge, if hereafter we should see fit to do so.

We showed that in 1840, the Whigs of the South were clamorous against Mr. Van Buren on account of his qualified acknowledgment of the constitutional power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia—that they then thought "interference" too weak ground for the cause of the South to rest upon, her only safety being in the prohibitions of the Constitution. We showed this to be true, so far as respects the Whigs of Madison County, by reference to two articles which appeared in the organ of that party in this county, the *Whig Advocate*, one under date of 11th June, and the other of 31st Oct. 1840, the latter article being addressed to the "Freemen of Madison County," announcing that on Monday, then next, the great contest for the maintenance of our republican government commenced, and warmly appealing to the people to "REMEMBER HIS [Mr. Van Buren's] ADMISION THAT CONGRESS HAS THE POWER TO ABOLISH SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA."—We then gave the more solemn evidence of the "professions and principles" of the Whigs of Mississippi in 1840, on this subject as contained in their manifesto to the log-cabin raising in July 1840 in which, amongst other grave charges against Mr. Van Buren, is the following:—"HE HAS CONCEDED THAT CONGRESS HAS THE CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO ABOLISH SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA." We showed that this manifesto ended its string of charges by saying—"all which practices and principles are of anti-republican and corrupting tendency and must result in the downfall of our free and democratic government and the establishment upon its ruins, of an odious despotism;" that it was therefore, resolved by the meeting, "that Martin Van Buren is totally unworthy and unfit to be the chief magistrate of the United States; and that it is the SOLEMN and IMPERATIVE DUTY OF EVERY TRUE HEARTED REPUBLICAN AND PATRIOT, to use all honorable means in his power to prevent his re-election to that high and responsible office."

Having thus, in our article, exhibited the professions and principles of the Whigs in 1840, on this subject, we proceeded to compare Mr. Clay's principles with them and showed that he fully and unequivocally admits the power of Congress to abolish slavery, not only in the District of Columbia, but in the territories. Had we stopped short here we would have exhibited Mr. Van Buren and Mr. Clay in equipoise; as occupying the same ground on this question of the power of Congress over slavery in the District of Columbia. But we went further and showed that Mr. Clay, on this question is more obnoxious to the south than Mr. Van Buren—that while they both admit the constitutional power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, Mr. Van Buren was pledged to veto a bill for that purpose, and, Mr. Clay is in effect pledged to sign one, in as much as he admits the power of Congress over the subject, and is the great champion of the doctrine that the president should interpose no veto to laws except for constitutional objections—and not only so, but that he is the leading advocate of the destruc-

tion of the veto power, whereby it would be rendered entirely immaterial whether the president should be opposed or not, to the abolition of slavery in the District, or even in the States, as he would have no power to prevent either.

Having thus shown the inconsistency of Mr. Clay's views on this subject with those the Whigs professed in 1840, we enquired whether the coming was to be any less a "contest for the maintenance of republican government," that the "Freemen of Madison County" should not now be required to remember Mr. Clay's admission that Congress has the power to abolish slavery not only in the District, but in the territories! Whether the Whigs of the south will now assist in elevating to the presidency, a man who entertains opinions which they then said "must result" in the downfall of our free and democratic government &c.—and we further enquired whether, if because Mr. Van Buren admitted the power, the Whigs resolved that he was "totally unworthy and unfit to be the chief magistrate of the United States" and that it was "the solemn and imperative duty of every true hearted republican and patriot to use all honorable means to prevent his re-election" should they not now make, for the same reason, a similar resolve in relation to Mr. Clay?

Now, how have these questions been answered? How have our "charges" against Mr. Clay been "blown to the winds." Has the verity of the extracts we gave, showing the Whig professions and principles of 1840, been questioned? No. Has it been denied that Mr. Clay acknowledges the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District—No, nor can it be. Let us examine, how it is that the *pro tem*, asserts so much in relation to Candour's review of our article.

It is said that the objection which the Whigs of 1840, urged against Mr. Van Buren on account of his view on this subject, were made to counterpoise the charge made in the south, that Genl. Harrison was an abolitionist. It seems to be admitted in the communication, that as an isolated question, it is entirely unimportant what views the president may entertain of the power of Congress over domestic slavery, provided he was "born and educated in Virginia which is a slave state," and "lives in a slave state and is the owner of slaves." Now we cannot agree that this is the fact—on the contrary it is well known that the declaration of the Whigs of 1840, was uttered against the admission of Mr. Van Buren, as an abstract question. It was said that but "once admit the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia and there was no longer any safety for the south; her only safety was in the prohibitions of the constitution; take away that obstacle and the abolition of slavery in the District first, and then in the states, would speedily follow. We appeal to the recollection of every man of sense to bear us out in this, and we would refer particularly to the speech of Judge Jennings, in the Court House, on the night of the Log Cabin Raising—a speech which received the plaudits of every Whig who heard it and especially called forth the praise of the "Whig Advocate." We would refer too, to one of the numbers of the same paper in which it is contended that mere "interference" of exercising the power of Congress over slavery which Mr. Clay admits is too weak ground for the cause of the south to rest upon—Let every one read the aforesaid appeal to the "FREEMEN OF MADISON COUNTY" in 1840, to remember, in the then "contest for republican government," the admission of Mr. Van Buren "that Congress has power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia"—let them read the charge made against Mr. Van Buren in the Whig manifesto before quoted and then respond whether the Whigs then made such grave a charge against Mr. Van Buren, merely, to prove that Genl. Harrison was not an abolitionist (for such is the argument)—let them respond, further, whether they were made only by way of set-off to the accusations made against Genl. H. or were not, rather, made as a distinct and substantive charge against Mr. Van Buren and an attack upon his opinions, on this subject, because they professed to believe them to be anti-republican and corrupting tendency and such as must result in the downfall of our free and democratic government, and the establishment upon its ruins of an odious despotism."—The charge was made, amongst others, to show "that Martin Van Buren is (was) totally unworthy and unfit to be the chief magistrate of the United States," and that it was "the solemn and imperative duty of every true hearted republican and patriot, to use all honorable means in his power to prevent his re-election."

But our reviewers say that we have taken "a part of a sentence which par objects to Mr. Van Buren's admission of the power to abolish, and then unfairly applied to it the general affirmation which was made in regard to some ten or twelve charges, thus; 'All of which practices and principles,' &c. We admit we did take part of a sentence, we could not have well done otherwise, for the whole series of charges, though distinct and separate themselves, are grouped in one sentence in the form of the Declaration of Independence, and are coupled by the use of colons, without any periods; but we gave the whole of that particular charge and not a part of it most unfairly said. Nor did we misap-

ply the "general affirmation," as stated, for it is evident that the expression "All of which practices and principles," &c. was intended to embrace each and every one of the preceding charges, including the one under consideration and it is a most undignified quibble, to contend for the reverse.

As to whether we were right in the use of the word *all* when we said the Whigs of the south could not support Mr. Clay without an "abandonment of all former professions and principles" is a new issue which we might admit or deny as we see fit, and yet it would not affect the present issue.—With regard however to the Bank question being "a profession or principle" which the Whigs of 1840 in this State would not abandon by the support of Mr. Clay, we can say, in passing, that a great many of them would, while we believe the great majority would not. The Whigs of this county in their manifest of 1840 said nothing about a bank,—the appeal to the "Freemen of Madison County," talked a great deal of gold spoons, the standing army, of Hooe's case, and of Mr. Van Buren's admission that Congress has power to abolish slavery in the District &c. but said nothing of a bank;—a bank is not therein mentioned in connexion with the "contest for the maintenance of republican government," which was to take place on the following Monday. On the other hand, we have before us the Whig Advocate of May 9th 1840, containing a long letter from one of the strong champions of "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," Senator Rives, in which he labors hard to show that Genl. Harrison was against a U. S. Bank. We might also refer to the address of the Whig Convention of Virginia, in 1840, to show the same thing.—In Georgia and North Carolina, Genl. Harrison was urged upon the acceptance of the people as an anti-bank man; and we have the admission of Mr. Badger himself, made in the Senate of the United States, showing that before one of the largest meetings held in N. C. in 1840, he indignantly proclaimed that the assertion that Genl. H. was a Bank man was false. Besides this he is well known to have been every where lauded by the Whigs of 1840, for his adherence to the principles of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, and to Mr. Madison's report thereon—the latter of which denounced the Bank, and all of which, were aimed at its destruction, it is well known too, that Genl. H. had pronounced the charter to the last Bank to be unconstitutional, and many persons here in the south voted for Genl. H. believing him to be anti-Bank; the suggestion of our reviewers then will not release such persons from the charge of abandonment of "all former professions &c."

We are next attacked for saying that Mr. Clay is the champion of the doctrine that the executive should interpose no veto except for constitutional objections. But how does Candour meet our charge? By shewing that Mr. Clay does not hold the doctrine ascribed to him? No; but by quoting the opinions of General Harrison! The Genl. expressed himself differently in his letter to Mr. Denny; therefore Candour, and his equally illogical endorser, concludes that Mr. Clay has not gone so far as we said he had. It is worse than idle to attempt to show that no such conclusion can follow from such premises. The attempted argument, coupled with what we shall presently show, proves only, if it proves any thing, that the Whigs of 1840, who supported Harrison and his views on the veto power, cannot, consistently, support Mr. Clay who entertains entirely different views of the subject.

We are called upon for the "book and page" wherein the authority we had for attributing such opinions to Mr. Clay may be found. This is the "unkindest cut of all!"—Having declined so unceremoniously, a similar call from us, Candour complies did not suppose we would comply with his. Had he supposed so, he would never have made the call; for he must know, if he knows any thing, how very easily we could furnish the proof that such are Mr. Clay's opinions on this subject. We did not give them in the first instance, because we thought that on a matter so universally known, it was "idle and ridiculous excess" to do so. As well might a man be called on to prove the plainest axioms in philosophy, or the best established and most prominent facts in history. We might multiply the proofs but we give only such as present themselves.—In Senate of U. S. January 24th 1842, Mr. C. moved certain resolutions in relation to the veto power.—In his speech on them argued chiefly from the force that should belong to the will of majorities, and contended that that will should never be interrupted. He argued that "no curb was necessary on the power of majorities."—He denounced the notion of a president's undertaking "on his own private opinion, to resist and suppress the will of the nation constitutionally expressed" and characterized the veto power as "tyrannical and despotic;" the exercise of which, he said, "must sooner or later, produce absolute

despotism." In the same speech Mr. Clay used the following language—

"On principle, certainly, the Executive ought to have no agency in the formation of laws. Laws were the will of the nation authoritatively expressed. The carrying of those laws into effect was the duty which ought to be assigned to the Executive, and this ought to be his sole duty, for it was an axiom in all free Governments that the three great departments, legislative, executive and judicial, should ever be kept separate and distinct. And a Government was the most perfect when most in conformity with this fundamental principle. To give, then, to the Executive any agency in the ascertainment and expression of the will of the nation, was so far a violation of this great and leading principle."

But our opponents professing not to be very sure they were right on this particular question, conclude their remarks by saying "we know at least, that you cannot prove that he advocates the destruction of the veto power. We think we have already done so by the preceding quotations from Mr. C's speech in Senate last winter—if more proof is required here it is:—

In the Senate U. S. 24th January 1842 Mr. Clay introduced the following resolution.

"That when a bill shall have passed the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States shall be returned by the President, with his objections to his approbation and signature, if upon its reconsideration, it shall again pass each House by a majority of all the members belonging to such House, notwithstanding the President's objections, it shall become a law; and the requisition by the existing Constitution of two-thirds of each House again to pass the bill in such case is hereby annulled."

We leave it to the intelligent reader to determine whether this is not in effect the destruction of the veto power—whether the power, after Mr. Clay's amendment shall have passed, will not be purely nominal—all its substance gone. But admitting that we are wrong in this our opinion, we yet have abundant evidence to prove that Mr. Clay holds the opinions attributed by us to him. In the before quoted speech Mr. C. admitted that the "principles he had laid down would, if carried fairly out, lead to the abolition of the veto altogether, as inconsistent with the fundamental axiom of free government, yet he was of opinion that this, like other reforms, should be introduced slowly and with circumspection, without suddenly rushing from one extreme to the other."

This is a distinct admission that the veto power is "inconsistent with the fundamental axioms of free Government," and that his principles lead to its abolition—that tho' in favor of its abolition, as being inconsistent with those principles, he was yet willing to try what he calls a modification of the veto power. He wished its abolition, slowly, and not by "suddenly rushing from one extreme to the other."

But something is said of Mr. Calhoun's supposed "inconsistency;" another new and false issue. If we had charged Mr. Clay with "inconsistency" then it would have been fair to have retorted, by shewing that our favorite was more so.—We pointed out not Mr. Clay's inconsistencies, but those of the Southern Whigs of 1840, who are now abandoning their then professed principles, to support Harry of the West.—If it can be shown that we have abandoned any principle by the support of Calhoun, it should have been done—such a retort would have been proper. Mr. Clay has doubtless changed on some questions—the bank question for instance. Mr. Calhoun denies that he has changed. We are willing to admit, for the argument, that Mr. Calhoun has done the same thing; but if he has, there is this important difference in the circumstances of their changes.—Mr. Clay always went over to the side of power—while Mr. Calhoun changed against power—the power and influence of the banks. Of their motives for their political changes we shall not ourselves, speak—on that question they have well spoken for themselves, when in 1833, in the Senate, Mr. Clay said Mr. Calhoun "had gone over, and left to time to disclose his motive." Mr. Calhoun retorted;—"What the Senator charges on me unjustly, he has actually done.—He went over on a memorable occasion, and did not leave it to time to disclose his motive."

#### SPECIMEN OF MR. CLAY'S DECENCY AND DIGNITY IN DEBATE.

MR. CLAY.—If the Senator, (Mr. Buchanan) would not be responsible for the (Swartwout's defalcation) would he answer for Jesse Hoyt?

MR. BUCHANAN. No, Sir.  
MR. CLAY.—What in the Devil are you responsible for?

The above extract is from the debate in the Senate of the United States, Feb. 14th 1842, on the custom-house frauds.—Mr. Clay's friends say he is a "great statesman." His greatness seems to us to be better suited to the pot-house, than that "more than amphyctonic council." The Senator of the U. States, Mr. Clay was right in resigning his seat.